

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 HEVI MOHAMMED, et al.,

10 Plaintiffs,

11 v.

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et  
al.,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. C16-1552 RAJ  
ORDER

14 This matter comes before the Court on Austin Mutual Insurance Company's  
15 ("Austin Mutual") Motion to Intervene. Dkt. # 18. Defendants do not oppose the  
16 motion. Dkt. # 20 ("[Defendants] neither support[] nor oppose[] the Motion . . .").<sup>1</sup>  
17 Austin Mutual meets the requirements under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 to  
18 intervene in this matter. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** the motion. Dkt. # 20.  
19 Dated this 19th day of September, 2017.

20  
21   
22

23 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
24 United States District Judge

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Austin Mutual claims that the parties had until July 17, 2017, to file an opposition to  
27 this motion. Dkt. # 21. This cannot be true. Austin Mutual filed its motion on July 17, 2017,  
and the motion was not fully noted until August 4, 2017. Therefore, an opposition was due by  
July 31, 2017. Defendants response—filed on July 31, 2017—was timely.